school board by the commissioner of the General Land Office at Washington, in conformity with the educational policy of the government. In 1866 the city of St. Louis purchased the island from the school board for the sum of $33,000. The deed to the city was signed by Felix Coste, president of the school board, and George Fitchenkamp, the secretary. During the Civil War the upper portion of the island was used as a burial ground by the government. After the city got possession it was used for quarantine purposes and called Quarantine Island. The old graves were subsequently washed away and the bones scattered from here to the Gulf. In 1867-8 City Engineer Moulton constructed a dyke at the foot of Bryan Street, the effect of which was to divert the channel from the west to the east side of the island, and also washed the head of the island down some 3,000 feet. Property-owners on the Illinois side, instigated by St. Louis lawyers, raised a howl of opposition against the destruction caused by the diverted currents and the prospective dismemberment of the island from their territory. The governor of Illinois was appealed to, and, in a correspondence with Mayor Brown, opposed the construction of the dyke on account of the damage that would accrue to farmers on the Illinois shore. The building of the dyke was stopped. The government interposed by erecting revetments and a dyke from the eastern shoulder of the island. This work formed a sand-bar on the south of and adjoining the island and increased the accretion, which became as high as the island proper. Nevertheless suits were instituted, which reached the Supreme Court of the United States, that court decreeing that the island belonged to Illinois. Thus the government which granted the island to St. Louis, by its highest court reclaimed and granted it to Illinois. Looking from the arsenal in a southerly direction, the migratory island is seen some distance down the river, snugly reposing near the Illinois shore. At night a light is seen glimmering from the same island that formerly lay abreast of the arsenal. Now the great river sweeps past with no obstruction to the view, and the entire channel passes the island on the western side thus sundering its former connection with the Missouri shore by the whole width of the river.

WILLIAM FAVEL.

Artesian Wells.—Two artesian wells have been bored in St. Louis, one of them the second deepest in the world, the deepest being that at Sperenberg, 4,194 feet. The first of the St. Louis wells was driven at the Belcher sugar refinery in North St. Louis, 300 feet west of the river bank, with the view of obtaining a supply of pure, clear water for manufacturing purposes. It was begun in 1849, and work ceased in 1854, when a depth of 2,199 feet had been obtained. The flow was seventy-five gallons per minute, the water being strongly impregnated with sulphur and salt, and of a temperature a little above seventy-three degrees, F. It is somewhat extensively used for medicinal purposes, being of nearly the same virtue as the Blue Lick Springs, of Kentucky. The other well referred to was bored by steam power at the insane asylum, in the southwestern part of the city, at the expense of St. Louis County. Work began March 31, 1866, and continued day and night, Sundays and holidays excepted, three years, five and a half months. A depth of 3,844 feet was attained, the last forty of which was through solid granite. The upper strata are chiefly shale, limestone and sandstone. The diameter of the bore for 1,022 feet from the bottom was four and a half inches. The temperature of the water struck at the lowest point was 105 degrees, F., its properties being about the same as the Belcher water, but it did not flow to the surface, and, as in the case of the other artesian well, the object of sinking was not realized.

Art Development in St. Louis.—The measure of a city's progress and prosperity can almost infallibly be ascertained by the respective development of its industrial and finer arts. There is hardly a branch of the numerous industries which go towards building up a city's importance which does not have to deal, more or less closely, with art or applied art. Hence, to say that a city has progressed in wealth or culture means that the arts in all their branches have been developed.

St. Louis was peculiarly fortunate in its introduction to art, by the fact that its founders were French people of refinement, who brought with them, or caused to be sent to them, those works of art without which that nation seems unable to thrive. So that, even before St. Louis had actual need of art, art was there. It was a good corner stone for the

great work which was in future to grow up with the city. However little may remain of these early examples, and they were mostly dedicated to the churches of the period, the influence that caused them to be imported into a semi-savage country is still felt, and has gradually made St. Louis an art center of the West.

This influence was necessarily first spread through the medium of the church. It was into the old cathedral that some of the finer copies of the old masters found their way, there to be seen and felt by a church-going people. No doubt there were good and bad pictures among them; but at that time the niceties of discrimination were necessarily curtailed, and the influence was in one direction only, the development of taste.

One can not trace the progress of art in any of its branches without considering that great factor in its support, i. e., taste. One can safely say: Without progress, no taste; without taste, no art; and vice versa.

There were enough people of wealth in St. Louis at a very early date, even before it became a wealth-producing city, to insure a certain amount of art patronage to the occasional itinerant portrait painter. These men, usually of foreign birth as well as training, traveled from city to city, and not infrequently wandered as far west as St. Louis. In the collections or the debris of old family collections of some of the founders of the city one can still find these usually ambitious paintings. Grand in scale and conception, full of purely historic detail which in every way detracted from the portraits of the persons represented, they were generally so bad in execution that they have gone to fill up that portion of art development through which most struggling, growing, ambitious cities have passed. No doubt, were they ever collected and displayed, one might find an occasional good picture, but as a whole they have served their purpose, and it it well that the dust of ages should hide their beauties from a too inquisitive and critical world.

Too much has been written of the importance, not to say necessity, of art training in the educational systems of the day to require special analysis or discussion here. Even as the early inhabitants had brought with them a certain inheritance of taste in art matters, so they must have felt and understood the need of it in the education of their children. At that time this training was in the hands of the Catholic clergy, and the St. Louis University, which is the outcome of these first educational institutions, has from the very beginning included drawing in its curriculum. It has been found that those children who have no special gift or aptitude for drawing are nevertheless benefited by this study. It teaches them, if nothing else, analytical observation, which in itself is a good weapon to possess in the struggle for life. This fact has long since been recognized by all professional educators, and has been embodied in the common school courses throughout the entire country.

St. Louis has not been far behind in these matters, and not only the St. Louis University but the public schools have taken up this idea, and in the very first steps of a child's education, the kindergarten work, the central idea is to teach the child to observe.

Aside from the merely educational impetus which art received in St. Louis was one of perhaps far more value and utility. As the industries of the city spread and grew strong, the necessity of skilled workmen became more evident. Skilled workmen meant men who had had special training in the industrial arts. Now, this training had not been given to the ordinary workmen. Neither the demand nor opportunity had existed heretofore. So skilled labor had to be imported. And with this importation came a second great stimulus to the art movement in St. Louis. It taught the working class, or the more intelligent portion of them, the need of an art education higher than that accorded to them by the common school education they had received. In other words, it created a demand for an industrial art education and was the first step toward the establishment of art schools.

Furthermore, the foreign lithographers, designers, moulders, decorators, wood-carvers, and the endless list of men who had made the applied arts a study, brought with them from their foreign countries a certain art atmosphere which was the foundation of the numerous art organizations which have lived and perished in St. Louis.

The establishment of art schools necessarily brought to the city men of a higher stamp than the skilled workmen. These men were more than educators, they were creators. They soon established either individual or collective exhibitions of their works, and, becoming known to the wealthy and refined people, were more or less locally patronized. Portraits in oil or

marble of prominent public men were soon in demand; private and public places were beginning to feel the demand for decoration of some kind, and with this demand the art movement in St. Louis was finally placed on a solid, progressive footing. The desire to possess individual collections of works of art no doubt fostered and promoted the desire for a higher class of dwellings. Architecture began to feel the new movement; public buildings were built with more consideration as to their artistic merits, and finally generous and public-spirited men felt the need and helped to establish museums accessible to the general public. This progress is still going on, and will in the development of art in St. Louis, no doubt, eventually realize in the highest degree the fondest anticipations of its promoters. To this the facts and data recorded below will amply testify.

It was only after the city grew in commercial importance, and after the accumulation of wealth insured a necessary outlay of money, that the people of St. Louis began to collect pictures and works of art worthy of mention. Wealth being no guarantee of taste or knowledge, these pictures were naturally not always of a very high order. Pictures were bought on the strength of the names attached to them, without reference to their merit, and in some cases, without proof of their authenticity. This tendency, however mistaken it may have been in itself, was but the first step in the right direction. Mistakes caused inquiry, and inquiry breeds knowledge. Gradually this indiscriminate buying gave way to a more careful and more judicious selection. Those who had no knowledge besought the aid of those whom experience had taught.

With the final possession of really good works of art, and the pride of those who owned them, came the establishment, in 1857, of the first "Loan" collection held in St. Louis. This was followed, as works of art were acquired by the growing number of collectors, by occasional exhibitions in the rooms of the St. Louis Public School Library, the Mercantile Library, and in the exhibition building of the "St. Louis Annual Fair and Exposition." These latter grew to be of no mean order of merit, and their influence established the Fine Art Department of the "St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association," which has grown to be a collection of works of art of an international reputation.

Perhaps one of the first and largest collectors of works of art in St. Louis was Hercules L. Dousman, who, in 1877, built an addition to his city mansion, destined to hold his valuable and rare collection. Of this collection, containing examples of the works of such men as Bouguereau, Louis Leloir, Gabriel Max, Constant, Corot, van Marcke, De Haas, Meissonier, etc., not one is left. They have, as has been the case in many others instances, been offered for sale and passed into other hands, to be scattered about in the various cities of the Union. This collection was the first one to which the St. Louis public had access, and paved the way toward a sentiment for the establishment of a public Museum of Art.

Some of these private collections have been most fortunately retained, and have from time to time been weeded out and added to. Such are the collections of Charles Parsons, Daniel Catlin, George E. Leighton, F. L. Ridgley, J. G. Chapman, Isaac Cook, Jr., John W. Kauffman and the late John T. Davis. There are many minor collectors, of whom Charles Clark and Halsey C. Ives are representative. Dr. John Green and Charles Nagel have always been staunch friends of the local artists, and own good works by most of them. Besides these, there were men whose tastes led them to gather works in a special direction, such as etchings, engravings, photogravures, autotypes, etc. Some of these have been bequeathed to the city libraries and to the Museum of Fine Arts, and contain some very rare and valuable examples.

In 1860, largely through the instrumentality of the Hon. Henry T. Blow, there was established a school of art called the "Western Academy of Art," and which, but for the untimely interference of the war, might have become one of the leading art institutions of the city. A representative collection of casts from the antique was bought and a school of design contemplated. These casts found their way finally into the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, though some of them have remained in possession of the St. Louis Public Library. There was formed in 1872 an organization for the culture and study of the fine arts, called the "Art Society." Such men as Thomas Richeson, J. R. Meeker, H. H. Morgan, Thomas Davidson, Dr. W. T. Harris, Dr. C. L. Bernays, Dr. J. Snider and others lent their influence to secure a good collection of autotypes of the best known examples of art, which

were publicly exhibited on the walls of the reading room of the Public School Library. Nothing could have had a better influence on the people of St. Louis. Though many may have passed them by without interest, or overlooked them, to others they were a source of much pleasure and profit, and sowed the seed of a public demand for works of art. Unfortunately this very excellent work was for a time suspended, but has of late been revived and broadened through the efforts of the public-spirited members of the art section of the "Wednesday Club."

In 1878 the "School of Design" was established and seemed to meet a real demand, until its promoter and supporter, Mrs. John B. Henderson, turned over its management to others, when for want of encouragement and financial help it failed and was permanently closed. Local art organizations have lived, flourished and died in St. Louis as they do everywhere, and it would be but a dreary disturbing of sacred ashes to bring all of them to light once more.

Among those which had an influence on the development of art in St. Louis the following may justly lay claim:

The St. Louis Sketch Club originated with J. R. Meeker in 1877. This organization was one of rather a professional character, members being either actively or passively connected with the fine arts. At first the meetings were held alternately in the studios of the active members, and much good was felt to spring from these informal meetings and friendly criticisms. But as the membership increased to seventy-five and over a special place of meeting was established. The club prospered until 1884 or 1885, when for various reasons the members saw fit to reorganize, and the Salmagundi Club was formed from dissenting members of the Sketch Club. This was the beginning of the end, and both organizations came to a close about 1886.

The St. Louis Artists' Guild was next formed and its charter members were the local artists of repute and one or two of the artists' staunch friends, as Dr. John Green and later Mr. Charles Nagel. There was a good deal of social amusement connected with this club, and its popularity became so great that applications for membership from the other professions, musicians and writers, were soon received. The original purpose of the Guild was still adhereed to, and those who were admitted were obliged to conform with the rules already established. Subjects for illustration were given and the resulting work freely criticised. Papers were read and art topics were discussed, and the serious part of the evening was followed by a Bohemian lunch and an easy time, in which much good-natured banter was exchanged. The Guild had its first meetings in one of the rooms of the Museum of Fine Arts, and continued there a number of years. In the last five years it has repeatedly changed its place of meeting, but since the autumn of the year 1897 it has found permanent and agreeable quarters in rooms, built for that purpose, adjoining the studio of Mr. R. P. Bringhurst, 1826 Locust Street. One of the features of the Guild has been its frequent exhibitions of members' work. The people most interested in art, and especially in local art, gather at these receptions, and the sales on these occasions have always been a source of great satisfaction to the exhibitors.

Another club of a purely professional nature was organized in 1895. It is called the St. Louis Association of Painters and Sculptors, and has for its object the yearly exhibition of works by local artists. Through the courtesy of the committee on exhibition of the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts the galleries of the Museum have been placed at the disposal of the association, and thus far these yearly exhibitions have met with great social success. Receptions have been held at appointed times by leaders in society circles, and under the patronage of these ladies almost all the sections of the city are reached, and the names and work of local artists pleasantly placed before the people.

The St. Louis Architectural Club is another organization which in its own line is doing good work. It keeps before its members the importance of working from nature, and the collection of sketches shows evidence of the skill and taste of its members.

In the southern part of the city some of the amateurs and lovers of art have formed an organization under the leadership of Mr. Schumacher, an artist and instructor, who, in the galleries of the club, Eighteenth and Chouteau Avenue, has a class of students from the antique and life.

But the real progress of art in St. Louis culminated and is clearly shown in the development of the St. Louis School and Museum of Fine Arts, and the importance of this work to

the commercial interests of the city can not be properly estimated without a general review of its aims and its condition.

It is perhaps astonishing that the usually alert and keen mind of the American public in general should be so blind to the commercial value of art training to their country. To quote from a reliable authority: "Fewer realize its value to the individual in his equipment to meet the exigencies of life. According to statistics published within the past two years, the American people pay a tribute of $200,000,000 annually to the superior ability of foreign workmen—designers and manufacturers—whose artistic sense and judgment are fostered by government aid." They failed to see that the real object of the many international and national expositions was to compare the artistic merit of the same products by the different countries. Much of the prestige which France enjoys over other nations is largely due to the very superior excellence of the taste shown in the manufacture of its productions—such as tapestries, calicoes, carpets, wall paper, porcelain, glass, bronzes—everything, in short, in the manufacture of which design may fill a conspicuous place, or in the production of which taste is required. This has yielded to France in the past such wealth in return for its industry that at the first great international exhibition in London, in 1851, the English became aware of the fact, and becoming conscious of the utter absence of taste in design in their own manufactures, established art training schools throughout the country, and entirely revolutionized the style and taste of English ornamental design. The South Kensington School in London is at the present time one of the most thoroughly equipped establishments of its kind extant, and has done more to forward the cause of popular art instruction than anything else. Up to 1878 the total sum appropriated by the government of the United Kingdom for the establishing and maintaining schools and museums of art was $17,000,000, and this investment was thought a profitable one to the State.

Coming from such an eminently practical people as the English are well known to be, these statistics demonstrate the hard-headed sense of the value and importance of artistic design as a source of national benefit and wealth, and will no doubt appeal more to the American minds than would the higher claims of art, which rest on ground too subtle and exclusive to be easily grasped by an unthinking people.

Perhaps what the exhibition of 1857 did for England the past and coming exhibitions held in this country and elsewhere, may do for America. Indeed, the improvement in taste among the masses of the people of a nation, as has been shown in this country since the Centennial Exhibition, is promising in the highest degree. In the minor branches of the industries of a country and in almost every detail the consideration of its artistic relation to other industries of the same nation comes into play. This would show that the idea of an art education should not necessarily be to train skilled artists, or to look upon drawing as an accomplishment that might grace future leisure hours, but as a means of training the mind, the hands and the eye for the business of life, no matter what special calling the student would follow. From a report of the superintendent of public schools we see that the subject has been surveyed from the proper point of view, and may be briefly summarized as follows:

"The effect of an art education upon the industries of a nation is no longer a matter of opinion, or belief, or speculation, but has become through actual experience a 'hard fact'; so much so that it has demanded the attention and action of the legislative bodies of leading nations and states."

The necessity for art knowledge in all departments of life demands attention from the housekeeper, the draper, the tailor, the milliner; in fact, in every occupation there is a demand for this sort of knowledge. The necessity for the cultivation of taste in general requires attention because of the effect that general refinement has upon the habits and life of the people.

All these considerations and many more entered into the establishment on a broad basis, of a school of fine arts in St. Louis.

In the public schools the matter was given serious attention, and "drawing" was made obligatory in all the primary departments, and is an elective course in the high school. Besides the course in drawing, a system has of late been employed by means of which sets of framed photographs are hung in the school rooms. These photographs of well-known works of art, are properly indexed and in cases where it is possible all the information in regard to the artist and the work itself is given. The system is a circulating one, and as one set

leaves one school another is put up to take its place. This has been found to be of great value to the pupils, lending a reality and interest to the work which could not be easily obtained in any other manner. Besides this, the same liberal-minded movers in the above scheme have it in mind to borrow paintings from the local artists, which shall be sent from school to school in the same rotary manner. This has met with the favor of the artists themselves and there is no doubt that the idea will be carried out in due time.

In the plans of Washington University an art department had been proposed from its beginning, but it was not until the work of Professor Halsey C. Ives had assumed proportions which commanded the respect of the directors of the University that the possibilities of its foundation were recognized. In 1874 Professor Ives secured the use of rooms on the upper floor of Washington University building, on Seventeenth Street and Washington Avenue, and organized free evening classes in drawing and design. To these classes he gave instruction, and on stated evenings during the winter months class lectures. The popularity of this work increased to such an extent that soon an assistant was required, and Mr. Carl Gutherz became connected with the practical development of the plan. The following year the number of assistants was increased to three, the number of class lectures was increased and the public admitted. The attendance was increased from forty or fifty students of the evening class to an audience of three hundred or more.

The evident demand for similar instruction in day classes was so apparent that a broader work than had heretofore been possible was organized. The result of this broadening of the work was so far beyond the expectations of the authorities of the university, that permission was given to Professor Ives to continue both the day and night classes in the rooms of the university building, and, although it was his personal work, it was tacitly recognized as a part of the work of the university by the authorities of that institution.

The work was continued under these conditions until May 22, 1879, at which time the board of directors of Washington University adopted an ordinance establishing, as a department of Washington University, the St. Louis School of Fine Arts. Naturally the man who had so courageously and persistently demonstrated the practicability of such an undertaking was placed in charge as its director. The passing of this ordinance, and the erection, the following year, of the building on the corner of Nineteenth and Locust Streets, the gift of Mr. Wayman Crow, formally established the permanency of the work and made it a definite factor in the art education of the city.

The museum building as erected at that time included a lecture room, known as Memorial Hall, ten galleries for the exhibition of sculpture and pictures, and working rooms in the basement and space in the attic, which has since been converted into store rooms and studios. At the time of the dedication of the building, May 10, 1881, it was still incomplete, and it has required constant and patient effort on the part of the members of the board of control and the director to secure the funds necessary for its completion.

The school of instruction continued its class work in the university building until 1890, when a foundation for a wing was laid adjacent to the museum, and temporary accommodations for the students were provided therein. The school found a home in these unfinished basement rooms until the autumn of 1897, at which time the lack of space had become so depressing and detrimental to the progress of the work, that completion of this part of the building was deemed a necessity. The work of construction was pushed rapidly towards completion, so that at the beginning of the following year the school was provided with one of the best planned and equipped homes in use by any other similar institution in the country. In spite of the numerous disadvantages with which the school has been forced to contend, it is safe to say that no better system of instruction, and no finer results have been obtained in any school in the United States.

The success of the school is largely owing to the fact that the work of the museum and the classes has always been closely connected. Students have from the beginning been urged to make free use of the varied collections exhibited in its galleries. The history of these collections is in itself interesting, and from the first board of control, which was created for the purpose of assisting the director in its management, the individual members who have been connected with the work have given generous support.

The first board of control appointed by the directors of Washington University was com-

posed of the following named gentlemen: James E. Yeatman, Wm. G. Eliot, John R. Shepley, John B. Henderson, Charles Parsons, Geo. E. Leighton, Thos. E. Tutt, E. A. Hitchcock, and Edwin C. Cushman. At the first meeting of the board Mr. Jas. E. Yeatman was elected president; he continued to serve in that office up to the autumn of 1883. During this time he was a constant contributor to the support of the work, as also were other members of the board. Mr. Cushman resigning his membership, Mr. J. G. Chapman was elected to fill the vacancy, as was also Mr. John T. Davis on the death of Mr. John R. Shepley.

The very comprehensive collection of reproductions of objects of art workmanship in metal, and the bronzes from the National Museum of Naples, are the result of the generosity of Mr. John T. Davis, who assumed the task of making collections in several branches of art work, which find expression in various metals. He was also a generous contributor to the fund held for the purchase of works of art of various kinds for the permanent collections.

A similar work was inaugurated by Mr. Joseph G. Chapman, who succeeded Mr. James E. Yeatman as president of the board of control. The various objects forming the interesting collection of modern ceramics and glass were contributed by Mr. Chapman. They were intended to form the nucleus of an extensive collection of the various styles of ceramics which it was his intention to place in the museum. He continued this work up to the time when ill health forced him to cease active connection with the institution. Mr. Chapman was always quick to respond to the needs of the museum as well as to those of the school of instruction. His gifts of works of art were not the only expression of his interest in the building up of an institution which should be worthy of the city which had been his home. He contributed generous sums to meet the expense of opening the museum free to the public on Sunday, also to the permanent endowment and building funds.

Among those who have taken an active interest in forming a collection of paintings are Messrs. Daniel Catlin, Charles Parsons and Geo. E. Leighton. Not only have these gentlemen presented examples representing contemporary pictorial art, but they have shown a broader interest in the work by helping to create a permanent fund which is to be devoted to the purchase of works of art. Mr. Parsons has also contributed to the building fund. On the retirement of Mr. Thos. E. Tutt, in 1889, Mr. Charles Nagel was made a member of the board of control. For a long time previous to his official connection with the board he had been actively interested in promoting the work of the night classes for industrial workers, also the maintenance of a fund to insure the free opening of the museum on Sunday. The permanent collection of pictures and sculpture has been enriched by several objects presented by Mr. Nagel. Mr. Ellis Wainwright became a member of the board on January 22, 1889, and upon the retirement of Mr. J. G. Chapman from the presidency, was elected to that office. Mr. Wainwright had been an active supporter in the educational work of the school and museum previous to his official connection with the board. Since his connection his interest has been frequently expressed in contributions of money for the maintenance of the classes in industrial and applied art; also in a generous gift which insured the erection of the library and reading room.

The work of the museum and the school of instruction has been maintained almost wholly by contributions. Among those who have contributed from time to time towards the purchase of works of art, to meet the current expenses and for extending the building, in addition to those mentioned above, are Dr. Wm. G. Eliot, Messrs. Thos. E. Tutt, John A. Scudder, Gerard B. Allen, A. F. Shapleigh, Geo. W. Wright, B. W. Clark, John R. Shepley, John B. Henderson, Wm. Barr, E. A. Hitchcock, I. W. Morton, John E. Liggett, John T. Davis, Jr., W. F. Obear, John R. Lionberger, Wm. J. Lemp, Joseph Franklin, W. L. Huse, N. C. Chapman, James S. Garland, D. D. Walker, Colonel Chas. S. Hills, W. H. Stuyvestant, Wm. McMillan, Adolphus Busch, John Scullin, D. C. Ball, H. C. Pierce, E. B. Adams, D. C. Brown, J. T. Drummond, Edward Mallinckrodt and Robert S. Brookings. In addition to these gentlemen, many others have generously contributed, according to their means, to the immediate demands for money needed in the support of the night classes and the school and museum work in general. But the space allowed for the naming of the innumerable benefactors of this work is too short to permit of all their names appearing.

Perhaps there is no greater evidence of the development of art in St. Louis than is shown in the exhibitions of works of art held in the city. Before the days of the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts and the St. Louis Music Hall and Exposition Company, the principal exhibitions of works of art were held at the St. Louis Exposition and Fair. Works were brought from Eastern collections, and often contained representative examples by well known artists. But there was a lack of unity in these exhibitions, and everything, good, bad and indifferent, was hung. Works by local amateurs were included, and the appearance of the walls was not always creditable to the judgment of those in charge of the affairs.

In 1883, with the erection of the St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall building, these "fair" exhibitions were transferred to the galleries in this new building, and became gradually a representative exhibition, that is to say, certain "schools" were shown and the public was given an idea of what the different phases of painting meant. Among collections represented, the following may be named: The Barbizon School, the Neo-Grec, the Impressionist, the Realist, the Academic, the Naturalist, the Glasgow School (exhibited for the first time in the United States at the St. Louis Exposition), and representative collections from the studios of American artists.

Since 1894 these collections have been under the management of Mr. Charles M. Kurtz, in whose hands they have assumed a character and reputation which is the envy of most of the larger cities in the Union. No possible method of public advancement can be more beneficial than these excellently arranged collections. There is no doubt that their influence is strongly felt by the working classes, who, as a rule, it is difficult to bring in contact with such matters.

In the galleries of the Museum of Fine Arts a similar good work is going on. The museum is in direct communication with most of the larger organizations of its kind in the cities of the East and West. All of the most important exhibitions are forwarded to St. Louis, and remain on exhibition in the galleries of the museum for a period of ten days or two weeks. These exhibitions are composed mostly of representative works by either individual artists, such as Zorn, Whitelaw Hamilton, Wm. L. Picknell, and many others, or of collections of art organizations from this and other cities. Among these are the Cosmopolitan Art Club, of Chicago, the Cincinnati Art Club, the Society of Western Artists, the annual exhibition of the St. Louis Association of Painters and Sculptors, etc.

Another evidence of the strides the city is making in the direction of artistic development is in its public buildings and in its parks and public squares. Many statues have been placed in prominent places, and no small sums of money have been expended in beautifying these places. No greater advance could be asked for than is shown between the old Union Depot and the new Union Station. It is the largest and possibly the most artistic in the country, and when its surroundings shall have been placed in accordance with the building itself the citizens of St. Louis will have ample cause to point it out as one of the great monuments of art progress in the city. The numerous large buildings in the business portion of the city do not always show a particularly artistic whole, but there are details and decorations in most of them that show steady progress in appreciation for the beautiful in the common affairs of life. The decorations in the new Planters' Hotel and in other public buildings are the works of local artists, and as the demand for new and better buildings grows, so also the demand for artistic work in their finish seems to increase. Recently a very unique and interesting photographer's gallery has been erected by Mr. Strauss, on Franklin and Grand Avenues, which is the work of a local architect, and which contains wall decorations and statues, also by local artists. These are the instances of the appreciation which is being shown in this city of the development of the art idea, and it is in this direction that it will be most widely encouraged and appreciated by a progressive people.

In conclusion a few words about the artists who have, from time to time, added their efforts to bring about these changes.

Among the sculptors who have materially helped St. Louis in its art development are the following:

Miss Harriet Hosmer, of whose works there are examples in some of the city parks (statue of Benton, Lafayette Park), in the Mercantile Library and in the Museum of Fine Arts. Howard Kretchmar, who was born in St. Louis, studied in Munich and Rome, and was

at one time a teacher in the St. Louis School of Fine Arts. Pietro Perrin, who worked in St. Louis from 1860 to 1870.

J. W. McDonald worked in St. Louis in 1860, and produced some of the busts now placed in the Mercantile Library, also the statue of Attorney-General Bates in Forest Park.

W. H. Gardner, a pupil of Howard Kretchmar, who assisted Mr. Kretchmar in decorating the facade of the Museum of Fine Arts, and executed the Blair monument in Forest Park. F. W. Ruckstuhl, a pupil of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, who studied in Paris after having worked in St. Louis a number of years. While abroad he executed the statue of Mercury and the Eagle now standing in Westmoreland Place.

Robert P. Bringhurst, a pupil of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, who studied in Paris, returning to St. Louis to take charge of the modeling class of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts. The statue of General Grant now on Twelfth Street is Mr. Bringhurst's work.

Among the early painters in St. Louis were portrait painters, such as:

Chester Harding, father of General Chester Harding and of the wife of Honorable J. M. Crum, of St. Louis. His first visit to St. Louis was in 1820. He painted a great many portraits in Boston about 1823, and, returning to England, he painted some of the nobility and other well known personages. He visited St. Louis last in 1866, when he painted General W. T. Sherman's portrait.

About 1840 Emanuel de Franca, a Portuguese nobleman, worked in St. Louis, and some of his portraits are of no mean order of merit.

In 1858, or thereabout, Ferdinand T. L. Boyle and a Mr. Wilkins painted portraits in St. Louis. The portrait of Governor Gamble, in the Mercantile Library, is the work of the former. Mr. Coggswell, who painted the portraits of Joseph Charless and Peter Lindell, did some good work in St. Louis about this time. His stay, however, was for two or three years only. A. J. Conant, who came to St. Louis in 1857, remained long enough to thoroughly identify himself with the art history of St. Louis.

Many painters of portraits lived and worked in St. Louis in these early years, and may be mentioned collectively:

Madame Subit, a very elaborate painter, Colonel Waugh, John Reid, Brewer, G. Mueller Powers and others also worked in the same minute, finished style. Miss Peale, well known as a portrait painter, worked in St. Louis up to 1878.

Among figure and landscape painters are the following:

Mr. Deas, an animal painter of some note, 1840-5. Thomas S. Noble, a pupil of Couture, who painted slave scenes in St. Louis in 1860. He was a good draughtsman and showed some strength in color.

Charles F. Wimar, who at the age of fifteen came to St. Louis and became a pupil of the artist Pomerede, whom he accompanied in 1849 on a sketching trip among the Indians. He showed such remarkable strength in his work that he was urged to study abroad, and spent five years in Dusseldorf, under Luetze. He executed a number of important works while abroad, all bearing on the life and pursuits of the Indians. One of these is now in the Mercantile Library. After his return he spent his life among the Indians, painting many pictures of the buffalo hunt. Most of these are owned in St. Louis. His last work was to decorate the dome of the court house. He died in 1863.

Conrad Diehl, a pupil of Kaulback and Foltz at Munich, and of Gerome in Paris, taught and worked in St. Louis, and did much to advance art education. W. M. Chase, as a painter of fruit, worked in St. Louis in 1870, before going abroad.

J. W. Pattison worked and taught in St. Louis from 1867 to 1872, and had charge, at one time, of the drawing classes of Washington University.

Paul Harney, who studied in Munich, began his career in St. Louis. He was for some years instructor in the School of Fine Arts of this city.

The same may be said of John Fry, Carl Guthertz (an idealist) and G. W. Chambers (recently deceased, of the firm of Chambers & Davis, stained-glass decorators). George C. Eichbaum still works in St. Louis as a portrait painter, coming here from Pittsburg, in 1859. Charles E. Moss was a student of Meeker in 1877, and has not returned to St. Louis since going abroad. J. R. Meeker was probably the best known of the early landscape painters, coming here in 1859. As paymaster in the United States Navy, Meeker became acquainted with swamp scenery, for which he afterward became so well known.

Louis Schultze was a contemporary of de Franca and did good work in figure and landscape painting.

Mr. Ritter was one of the first teachers of art in Washington University, and painted many large pictures of mountain scenery in Germany and Switzerland. Thomas Allan Jr., began studying landscape painting with Pattison in 1872. Since studying abroad he has made his home in Boston.

W. L. Marple, J. M. Tracey (the animal painter), Cox, Bissel, Mrs. A. S. Bryant and J. M. Barnsley have all worked more or less in St. Louis, and helped the good cause.

Harry Chase spent his early student days in St. Louis, and studied later in the Munich school, and with Mesdag at the Hague, in Holland. Many of his pictures are owned in St. Louis.

Frederick Lippelt was at one time a student, and later an instructor, in the St. Louis School of Fine Arts. He studied abroad, and showed fine feeling for composition and color. He was drowned while rescuing a comrade. The students of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts have erected a bronze monument to his memory in token of the general esteem in which he was held. This bronze is the work of Mr. Bringhurst. J. Douglas Patrick was another of the St. Louis students who, studying and making a good name for themselves abroad, returned to St. Louis in the capacity of instructor. He was a man with powerful technique and excellent color, very much in the spirit of his French master, Benjamin-Constant. He has left the city, and at present makes his home in Kansas.

Wm. H. Howe was a clerk in a dry-goods house of this city before going abroad to study art. Under de Thoren and de Vuillefroy he has become one of the leading cattle painters of the country. Many of his pictures are owned in St. Louis.

Among the artists living in St. Louis to-day are Chas. F. von Saltza, portrait painter; Edward M. Campbell, landscape painter; Charles Percy Davis, painter and designer; Holmes Smith, water color painter; Edmund H. Wuerpel, portrait and landscape painter, and Charles Ward Rhodes; these are now on the staff of the faculty of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts.

Besides these are: Paul Cornoyer, Benjamin C. Brown (now in California), J. W. Cunningham, Louis F. Berneker, Ralph Ott, Richard E. Miller, Robert M. Root, Louis O. Jurgenson (now of Chicago), and Fred L. Stoddard, a designer in stained glass, decorator and painter of much ability.

Misses Lillian M. Brown, Anna Shands, Martha H. Hoke, Cornelia F. Maury, Ruth Sterling, Sophie N. Schuyler and Mrs. E. R. Hoyt, Mrs. A. M. G. Pattison, Mrs. C. H. Blackman and Mrs. Mary Davis Chambers are some of the painters whose names are not unknown to the public of St. Louis.

EDMUND H. WUERPEL.

Artists' Guild.—See "Art Development in St. Louis."

Art League of St. Louis.—In November, 1895, the Art League movement was brought to the attention of the art section of the Wednesday Club by Miss Mary E. Bulkley. Her suggestions excited great interest, and at once the Art League of the Wednesday Club was formed, with Miss Bulkley as its head; Miss Amelia C. Fruchte, chairman of the press and school committee; Mrs. Everett W. Pattison, chairman of gifts and purchases committee; Mrs. Charles L. Moss, chairman of distribution committee; and Mrs. E. B. Leigh, chairman of ways and means committee. Having obtained permission from the school board to place works of art in the school rooms of St. Louis, on condition that the board should incur no expense, this little band of women began its work. The first gift of money was the sum of fifty dollars received from Mrs. J. C. Van Blarcom. At the same time Mrs. William Lee Huse gave a collection of twenty framed photographs, and on the 24th of December the five original members of the league went with these pictures to the Columbia school, and, after a few brief remarks, placed them in that school. In May, 1897, the league felt it had proved its usefulness and its ability to stand alone. Leaving the protection of the Wednesday Club, it formally organized, taking as its name "The Art League of St. Louis." The avowed objects of the association are to increase interest in art; to teach the future citizens of St. Louis, by pictures and casts in school rooms, what has been already accomplished in painting, sculpture and architecture; to familiarize youth with the faces of the world's great men and with historic and beautiful places, and to create a demand for beauty in every-day life. The